

Remarks

The Office Action dated March 24, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 and 7-13 stand rejected. Claims 14-21 are allowed.

The rejection of Claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Heyde et al. (FR 2,626,016) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 of the present application recites an outer door panel for a dishwasher "comprising: . . . a control panel mounting surface within said frame and surrounded by said frame outer surface, said control panel mounting surface inclined with respect to said longitudinal axis, such that said control panel mounting surface is mostly shielded by said outer surface."

Heyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher as recited in Claim 8. Particularly, as best understood, Heyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher that includes a control panel mounting surface within the door panel frame and surrounded by the frame outer surface with the control panel mounting surface inclined with respect to the longitudinal axis of the door panel, such that the control panel mounting surface is mostly shielded by the outer surface. Rather, Hyde et al. show in Figures 1 and 3 a washing machine door panel with a control panel mounted on top of the outer surface of the door panel. None of the Hyde et al. figures show a control panel mounting surface that is inclined such that the control panel mounting surface is shielded by the outer surface of the door panel. As specifically shown in Figure 1 of Hyde et al., the control panel 30 is mounted on the

outer surface of the door panel. Therefore, the control panel mounting surface cannot be shielded by the outer surface if the outer surface is the mounting surface. Further, the supplied English language abstract does not describe nor suggest an inclined mounting surface. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 8 is patentable over Hyde et al.

Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 8. When the recitations of dependent Claim 10 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 likewise is patentable over Hyde et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102(b) rejection of Claims 8 and 10 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyde et al. (FR 2,626,016) in view of Lapi (US 5,921,645) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Hyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher as recited in Claim 8. Accordingly, Claim 8 is patentable over Hyde et al.

Claim 1 of the present application recites an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly "comprising: . . . an outer surface extending from said frame and bowed between said lateral sides; and a recessed control mounting surface extending inwardly from said outer surface between said lateral sides, said recessed control mounting surface disposed at an angle with respect to said longitudinal axis."

Hyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, and as explained above, Hyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel that includes a recessed control mounting surface extending inwardly from the outer surface between the lateral sides, with the recessed control mounting

surface disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis. Rather, Hyde et al. show in Figures 1 and 3 a washing machine door panel with a control panel mounted on top of the outer surface of the door panel. None of the Hyde et al. figures show a control panel mounting surface that is recessed and disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis of the door panel. As specifically shown in Figure 1 of Hyde et al., the control panel 30 is mounted on the outer surface of the door panel. Therefore, the control panel mounting surface cannot be recessed and disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis of the door panel if the outer surface is the mounting surface. Further, the supplied English language abstract does not describe nor suggest an recessed mounting surface. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Hyde et al.

Lapi is cited for teaching a bowed door. Lapi is not cited for, and does not teach, an outer door panel that includes a recessed control mounting surface extending inwardly from the outer surface between the lateral sides, with the recessed control mounting surface disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis.

Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly as recited in Claim 1 nor an outer door panel for a dishwasher as recited in Claim 8. Particularly, and as explained above, Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly that includes a recessed control mounting surface extending inwardly from the outer surface between the lateral sides, with the recessed control mounting surface disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1 and 8 are patent able over Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from independent Claim 1 and Claim 9 depends from independent Claim 8. When the recitations of dependent Claims 2 and 7 and dependent Claim 9 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claims 1 and 8 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 7, and 9 likewise are patentable over Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, and 9 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyde et al. (FR 2,626,016) in view of Lapi (US 5,921,645), and further in view of Stottmann (US 5,453,586) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over Hyde et al. and Lapi, alone or in combination.

Stottmann is cited for teaching a cutout with a plastic escutcheon received therein. Stottmann is not cited for, and does not teach, an outer door panel that includes a recessed control mounting surface extending inwardly from the outer surface between the lateral sides, with the recessed control mounting surface disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis.

Hyde et al., Lapi, and Stottmann, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, and as explained above, Hyde et al., Lapi, and Stottmann, alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for an appliance door assembly that includes a recessed control

mounting surface extending inwardly from the outer surface between the lateral sides, with the recessed control mounting surface disposed at an angle with respect to the longitudinal axis.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Hyde et al., Lapi, and Stottmann, alone or in combination.

Claims 3-5 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 3-5 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-5 likewise is patentable over Hyde et al., Lapi, and Stottmann, alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 3-5 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heyde et al. (FR 2,626,016) in view of Stottmann (US 5,453,586) is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, Hyde et al. do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher as recited in Claim 8. Accordingly, Claim 8 is patentable over Hyde et al.

Stottmann is cited for teaching a cutout with a plastic escutcheon received therein. Stottmann is not cited for, and does not teach, an outer door panel for a dishwasher that includes a control panel mounting surface within the door panel frame and surrounded by the frame outer surface with the control panel mounting surface inclined with respect to the longitudinal axis of the door panel, such that the control panel mounting surface is mostly shielded by the outer surface.

Hyde et al. and Stottmann , alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher as recited in Claim 8. Particularly, and as explained above, Hyde et

al. and Stottmann , alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest an outer door panel for a dishwasher that includes a control panel mounting surface within the door panel frame and surrounded by the frame outer surface with the control panel mounting surface inclined with respect to the longitudinal axis of the door panel, such that the control panel mounting surface is mostly shielded by the outer surface. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 8 is patentable over Hyde et al. and Stottmann , alone or in combination.

Claims 11-13 depend from independent Claim 8. When the recitations of dependent Claims 11-13 are considered in combination with Claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11-13 likewise are patentable over Hyde et al. and Stottmann , alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 11-13 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Tersillo", written over a horizontal line.

Michael Tersillo  
Registration No. 42,180  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070